DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 081 SO 007 169

AUTHOR Rokkan, Stein
TITLE Politics Between Economy and Culture. Introductory Statement.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the International Political Science Association (Ninth World Congress, Montreal, August 19-25, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; Conflict; *Culture; Culture Conflict; Culture Contact; *Economics; Foreign Relations; *International Education; *Linguistics; Models; *Political Science; Politics; Social Systems; Speeches

ABSTRACT

The introductory statement to the plenary session of the Ninth World Congress of the International Political Science Association announces the first of two major themes, politics between economy and culture. This theme is described as investigating the culture-economy dialectic at all levels of politics -- global, territorial, national, community, and individual. The statement describes several models and analytical tools related to the disciplines at the two polar ends of the dialectic: economics and linguistics. The papers presented within this theme are on the following topics: Economic Models for Political Analysis: Markets, Elections, Public Goods; The Cultural Analysis of Political Action: Codes, Meanings, Styles; Models of Policy: Social, Economic, Cultural; Center vs. Periphery: Economic, Culture and Ideological Dimensions of Territorial Conflict; Economic Class and Cultural Identity; The Politics of Linguistic Conflict; Religion as a Factor in Identity-Building; Economy and Culture in the Politics of Nation-Building; The Politics of Regional Integration; Economic Interdependencies and Cultural Entrenchments; The Political Roles of Violence; and the Political Economy of Mass Communications. Instructions for ordering conference materials are included. (Author/KSM)

I. P. S. A. | International Political Science Association
A. I. S. P. | Association Internationale de Science Politique

IXth World Congress
MONTREAL
19-25 / VIII / 1973

Secretariat général : Rue des Champs Elysées 43 — B - 1050 Bruxelles - Belgique
Tél. : Bruxelles : 48.34.38

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 090081

Theme I

POLITICS BETWEEN ECONOMY AND CULTURE
LA POLITIQUE ENTRE L'ECONOMIE ET LA CULTURE

Stein ROKKAN

"INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT "

SØ 007169

S R DRAFT OF INTRODUCTION:

PLENARY SESSION

THEME I

MONDAY 20 AUGUST, 2:30 p.m.

Colleagues, friends, ladies and gentlemen,

the first of the major themes of this Ninth World Congress is:

POLITICS BETWEEN ECONOMY AND CULTURE.

You will naturally ask: What led us to choose this particular theme for this particular Congress? What did we have in mind, and what did we hope to achieve?

There is no one simple answer: there are several layers of answers.

First the obvious actuality of this theme is this city: we are living amidst a great variety of manifestations of conflict, of strain between economic exigencies and cultural cravings, and these manifestations pose crucial problems for the science of politics, whether we engage in worldwide comparisons, whether we study our host country Canada, or concentrate on this great city of Montreal.

We see reflections of this culture-economy dialectic at all levels of politics: at the global level in the study of dominance, interdependence and dependence in the international system, at the level of the territorial polity in the study of advancing centres and resisting peripheries, at the level of the local community in the study of the interaciton of economic and cultural elites, of the spread of ideologies of opportunity versus ideologies of identity, of the dialectic of individual exit and collective voice.

The conflict, the strain between culture and economy goes deep into the heart of our discipline: it is a constant source of challenge to theory-building and it also forces us to ask questions about the distinctiveness of our models and our analytical tools and to keep a close watch on developments in the disciplines at the two polar ends of the dialectic: economics and, among the sciences of culture, linguistics.

In my own work on nation-building and mass politics in Europe I have again and again been confronted by the challenge of this dialectic. I have tried to systematize the historical information on electoral developments and the growth of party systems and have been struck by the extraordinary dynamics of interaction between the spread of the economic revolution and the thrust of the cultural response. I have become increasingly convinced that the great variations in the ways mass politics came to be structured in Europe will have to be explained through a dynamic model for differences over time in the interaction of conflicts in the economy and conflicts over cultural standardization: a model, in fact, of the cross-currents produced by the Industrial and what I call the National Revolution. I have not applied this model to other regions, but I have discussed similar schemes of analysis with scholars active in the study of a wide variety of societies across the world and the conclusion is very much the same: to understand variations in the internal structuring of territorial politics we have to develop tools for the analysis of the interaction, the interpenetration of economic processes and cultural reactions. We cannot hope to approach a general theory of political systems without a thorough analysis of the ways in which economy and culture interact in the extraction and use of resources, in the definition and the categorization of memberships, in the control and the differentiation of boundaries.

My own work on the history of mass politics in Europe has brought me to the conviction that our next great job in political science is the systematic study of borders and boundaries: not just of territorial lines of division but of the processes making for a weakening or a strengthening of the control of transactions across systems. In studying the politics of boundary-building and boundary differentiation we shall clearly have to learn a great deal from economists and economic historians but we shall also have to pay increasing attention to the theories and the findings of the students of communication, quite particularly the linguists.

My own work on variations in the conditions of nation-building in Europe has been profoundly influenced by two great economic thinkers, Harold Adams INNIS and Albert O. HIRSCHMAN.

Harold INNIS's great achievements have long been recognized among economists and also have become widely known among philosophers and sociologists of communication. However, his work has not yet entered the central corpus of comparative political science. This is strange and regrettable: most political scientists have perhaps been rebuffed by his shameless display of historical erudition and by the many cryptic transitions of his reasoning. I hope very much that the discussions at this Congress will help to make his work better known. I would strongly urge our Canadian colleagues to organize one or two symposia on the implications of INNIS's work for current theorizing in comparative politics: there is a great need for systematic translation of his core concepts and analyses into the language of contemporary research.

From my particular perspective, Harold INNIS made one decisive contribution: he showed how changes in the technique and in the economy of communication over long distances conditioned the territorial reach and the cultural content of political systems. INNIS's great strength as a scholar lay in his uncommon grasp of concrete details and his extraordinary ability to see connections, parallels, isomorphies. He had started out by studying the standard staples of the Canadian economy, fur, cod, minerals, but had become increasingly impressed by the importance of long-distance transportation and communication in the development of economic empires. He devoted the last years of his life to the study of the great staples required for cultural communication: papyrus, parchment, paper. These are the studies of most direct importance for the comparative theory of political systems. INNIS shows convincingly how the transition from oral to written communication favoured the development of the Hellenistic and the Roman empires and how the transition to paper and printing prepared the ground for the great organizational innovations of the modern age: the network of trading centres and the bureaucratic nation-states. INNIS saw very clearly that the same technological developments underlay the two great changes of the 16th to the 18th centuries: the boundary-transcending force of commercial capitalism and the boundary-accentuating force of vernacular national culture. This was INNIS's greatest achievement: he focussed attention on the technology of communication underlying the economy-culture dialectic.

INNIS paid only passing attention to the politics of the new media of the 20th century: radio, film, television. At this Congress, one of the Commissions under our theme I will focus on the political consequences

of the printed versus the electronic media: the Commission headed by our colleague Alfred GROSSER. But this Commission deals with the media of communication to the masses. INNIS was much more concerned with the consequences for polity-building of changes in the technology of person-to-person communication, whether in armies, territorial bureaucracies or commercial or industrial corporations. If he had lived to analyze in detail the consequences of the electronic revolution he would not only have had to consider the telephone but also the technology of bugging and taping. He would have been fascinated by the politics of Watergate: the disruption of political culture brought about by electronic listening devices, the blurring of the boundaries between private and public, oral and recorded, communication.

INNIS focussed on the over-all functions of technologies of communication for the emergence and decline of systems of long-distance control, whether empires, nation-states or multi-national corporations. By contrast, the economist HIRSCHMAN is less concerned with the origins or the fate of such large-scale systems and more with ways of responding to them: with strategies in coping with decline in performance. In his intriguing Exit, Voice and Loyalty, HIRSCHMAN presents a simple model for the analysis of communications between the recipients and the providers of goods, services, facilities, policies: communications between customers and firms, employees and employers, parents and school authorities, taxpayers and officials, subjects and governors. What makes this essay of such great interest is not the attempt to analyze political processes in economic terms we have seen a ploethora of such attempts in the recent decade: what makes

it intriguing is the attempt to introduce political concepts into the analysis of economic relations. HIRSCHMAN not only generalizes from the market to the polity: he also studies the possibilities of introducing the mechanisms of political response into the economy. To be more precise he not only analyzes the uses of the typical market response of exit in such eminently political situations as elections of officers, resignations from office and exile to another territory; he also analyzes the uses of the pre-eminently political device of voice, of demonstrations, referenda and elections in relation to producers, employers and providers of services. HIRSCHMAN's is a genuine attempt at bridge-building in the social sciences and it is particularly important at this Congress between his distinctions to fit our theme so directly: Voice is the essence of Politics, Exit represents the Economy, and Loyalty can be interpreted to represent a decisive component of Culture.

We had hoped to have HIRSCHMAN take part in this plenary session and to have him expound in further detail the possible applications of his model at different levels and in different sectors of society. Personally I would very much have wanted to have heard him elaborate further on the links between his concept of loyalty and the various components of culture. Unfortunately HIRSCHMAN could not come to our Congress but his work will no doubt be discussed in a number of the Commissions under our theme.

Paradoxically this important essay by an eminent economist raises fundamental questions about the limits of economic reasoning: about the cultural and the political conditions for the emergence and the maintenance of market mechanisms.

From a broader theoretical perspective, HIRSCHMAN's essay is particularly important because it focusses attention on the boundaries for the exertion of market choices and the channeling of voice. What made the HIRSCHMAN volume so important for me in my personal work was that it forced me to think seriously about boundaries. In the analysis of economic transactions boundaries can be dealt with within a strict cost-benefit perspective: tariffs, labour market restrictions, restrictions on the transfer of capital and technology. As soon as you try to tackle the politics of transactions across boundaries you have to develop much more complex models: you have to consider a wider range of motives both for the transcendence of borders and for the protection of the integrity and the distinctiveness of the given territorial system. In the simplifying model I have worked out for differentiations within Europe I distinguish three sets of border transactions: the exit and the entry of goods and services, the exit and the entry of agents of control, the exit and the entry of messages. In the total autarky there is complete isolation from the surrounding world: no import or export, no visas in or out, censorship of all messages crossing the frontiers. In the totally open society the borders would be simply lines on the map: nothing would happen to anything or anyone crossing them. The historically important cases can all be ranged at points between these extremes, but on different dimensions: what we have to study are the strategies for differentiated control and the consequences of such strategies for the configurations of political resources inside each territory.

To develop a general theory of the building, maintenance and differentiation of system boundaries we clearly have to go beyond the strict confines of politics and economics: we have to see what can be learnt from the analyses and the findings of biologists, of linguists, of anthropologists. What is so intriguing about HIRSCHMAN's essay is that it compels you to think through a dazzling variety of conceptual polarities across all levels of living systems: from molecular biology to theories of animal and human communication, from the ecology of the gene pool through the study of human kinship structures to the geopolitics of nation-building, from the ethology of territoriality and boundary maintenance to the economics of long-distance trading.

At all levels of life we can identify structures and processes ensuring some minimal maintenance of established systems: the genetic code in cells, the homeostatic mechanisms and the immune defenses in organisms, the mechanisms for ensuring reproductive isolation in animals, the rites and the languages separating one human population from the other.

In Hirschman's model these would be the loyalty mechanisms: the structures forcing the component parts to stay within the given system.

At all levels of life we can also identify structures and processes ensuring communication among component parts and from one system to another: the RNA molecules in cells, the nervous system in organisms, the signals and the symbols developed in interactions among animals and among humans.

In Hirschman's model these would be voice mechanisms: structures ensuring regular supplies of information from component parts and from outside about conditions affecting the functioning of the system.

At all levels of life, we can finally identify sources of change and breakdown, transformation and transcendence: mutations in the DNA chains,

invasions of viruses into organisms, hybridization of plant and animal populations, shifts in ecology, new opportunities, new resource combinations created through long-distance mobility and interchange.

In the Hirschman model, a crucial mechanism of change is the exit: the transfer of a component part from one system to another, the crossing of an established boundary.

There are well-known hazards in the study of evolutionary parallels or analogies: we know of only too many examples of rash speculations on the basis of flimsy and accidental information. But there are many signs indicating that we are entering a phase of serious and systematic analyses of the implications of our biological heritage for the structuring of human societies and political systems. Personally, I see fascinating possibilities of theory development in the studies by population geneticists and by ethologists of mechanisms and rituals of reproductive isolation and spatial separation: the extraordinary range of devices to protect gene pools against hybridization and the fascinating repertoires of signals and postures designed to demarcate the borders of home ranges for troops of primates. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the development of human languages served parallel purposes of isolation, separation, identity-building: the gift of language was uniquely and universally human, common to the species homo sapiens , but the functions of the particular languages established within particular ecologically delimited populations was to strengthen boundaries, to build up distinctive cultures.

Noam CHOMSKY and his disciples have argued with great force that languages cannot possibly be passed on from generation to generation

through ordinary processes of learning: the acquisition of languages can only be explained through the development of a species-specific capacity to search for and to construct rules of phonetics, syntax and semantics and to make creative use of such rules in the formulation of endless varieties of sentences never directly learned. But children are not given a chance to search for rules in more than one, two or at best three languages during their phase of maximal capacity: the ability to reconstruct languages is universal but this great potential is only realized in quite specific and quite limited contexts, the contexts of the corporate groups surrounding the child, whether family, lineage or local community. And what is even more important is that this process of language acquisition is part and parcel of a general process of growth into the culture of that particular corporate group: it is part of a general process of identity-building, of ego strengthening. This is the human predicament: the language or languages acquired in the early phase of childhood help to build up the ego and tie the ego to the rituals, the customs, the cultural identity of what biologists would call the home range. This predicament sets definite costs both for individual exit and for the extension and merger of home ranges into larger territorial collectivities. There are technologies for overcoming such costs: the invention of writing was a decisive first step, the organization of script religions and systems of education another. But these technologies only weakened some borders and strengthen others: the commitment to shared cultural heritages clashed with the exigencies of economic expansion no less than with the ambitions of the builders of empires and nation-states. There is a culture-polity dialectic

as well as a culture-economy dialectic: in formulating a major theme for this Congress we tried to join up this double dialectic into a triangle of interdependencies.

You will recognize this triangular structure in commission after commission under our theme. You will find sessions focussing on politics and culture from the vantage point of the economic theory of public goods. You will find sessions on the cultural analysis of political action and you will find a broad range of discussions of the politics and the economics of linguistic conflict, of nation-building, of the supranational regional communities. You will also find a number of commissions on particular components in this interplay between culture, economy and politics: sessions on centre-periphery contrasts, sessions on economic class and cultural identity, on the role of the church, the mass media and of the institutions of violence in this triangle of relationships. We chose twelve fields for detailed discussion of this great theme: we could no doubt have defined twelve more. What is important is not the number of fields of application, but the over-all intellectual effort. If political science is to become truly a world-wide discipline it must not flinch from facing the great issues: the proliferation of multi-national economic networks, the stubbornness of local and national cultures. And our discipline must not flinch from constant two-way exchanges with the other sciences of life, man and society. We have our unique responsibility: it is our job to study the development, the structuring, and the performance of systems of government. But we cannot hope to move forward towards higher levels of systematization and understanding without close interaction

with the disciplines which can tell us about the objects of political control and communication: individuals and families, cultural communities, economic organizations and networks. Our discipline has a clearcut and well-established subject, but in studying that subject we must never abandon the search for methods, models, ideas, clues across the entire range of the sciences of life, man, culture and society.

Et maintenant j'ai le grand honneur de vous présenter un des grands chefs de file de la science politique de notre pays hôte, un des architectes de cette enquête extraordinaire sur la politique des langues et des cultures du Canada, l'enquête de la Commission Royale sur le Bilinguisme et le Biculturalisme. Je vous présente le collègue, Leon Dion, professeur de science politique à l'Université Laval.

POLITICS BETWEEN ECONOMY AND CULTURE:

introductory statement at
the Ninth World Congress
of Political Science,
Montreal, 20 Aug. 1973

By
Stein ROKKAN

Colleagues, friends, ladies and gentlemen,

The first of the major themes of this Ninth World Congress is:
POLITICS BETWEEN ECONOMY AND CULTURE.

You will naturally ask: What led us to choose this particular theme for this particular Congress? What did we have in mind, and what did we hope to achieve?

There is no one simple answer: there are several layers of answers.

First the obvious actuality of this theme is this city: we are living amidst a great variety of manifestations of conflict, of strain between economic exigencies and cultural cravings, and these manifestations pose crucial problems for the science of politics, whether we engage in worldwide comparisons, whether we study our host country Canada, or concentrate on this great city of Montreal.

We see reflections of this culture-economy dialectic at all levels of politics: at the global level in the study of dominance, interdependence and dependence in the international system, at the level of the territorial polity in the study of advancing centres and resisting peripheries, at the level of the local community in the study of the interaction of economic and cultural elites, of the spread of ideologies of opportunity versus ideologies of identity, of the dialectic of individual exit and collective voice.

The conflict, the strain between culture and economy goes deep into the heart of our discipline: it is a constant source of challenge to theory-building and it also forces us to ask questions about the distinctiveness of our models and our analytical tools and to keep a close watch on developments in the disciplines at the two polar ends of the dialectic: economics and, among the sciences of culture, linguistics.

In my own work on nation-building and mass politics in Europe I have again and again been confronted by the challenge of this dialectic. I have tried to systematize the historical information on electoral developments and the growth of party systems and have been struck by the extraordinary dynamics of interaction between the spread of the economic revolution and the thrust of the cultural response. I have become increasingly convinced that the great variations in the ways mass politics came to be structured in Europe will have to be explained through a dynamic model for differences over time in the interaction of conflicts in the economy and conflicts over cultural standardization: a model, in fact, of the cross-currents produced by the Industrial and what I call the National Revolution. I have not applied this model to other regions, but I have discussed similar schemes of analysis with scholars active in the study of a wide variety of societies across the world and the conclusion is very much the same: to understand variations in the internal structuring of territorial politics we have to develop tools for the analysis of the interaction, the interpenetration of economic processes and cultural reactions. We cannot hope to approach a general theory of political systems without a thorough analysis of the ways in which economy and culture interact in the extraction and use of resources, in the definition and the categorization of memberships, in the control and the differentiation of boundaries.

My own work on the history of mass politics in Europe has brought me to the conviction that our next great job in political science is the systematic study of borders and boundaries: not just of territorial lines of division but of the processes making for a weakening or a strengthening of the control of transactions across systems. In studying the politics of boundary-building and boundary differentiation we shall clearly have to learn a great deal from economists and economic historians but we shall also have to pay increasing attention to the theories and the findings of the students of communication, quite particularly the linguists.

My own work on variations in the conditions of nation-building in Europe has been profoundly influenced by two great economic thinkers, Harold Adams INNIS and Albert O. HIRSCHMAN.

Harold INNIS's great achievements have long been recognized among economists and also have become widely known among philosophers and sociologists of communication. However, his work has not yet entered the central corpus of comparative political science. This is strange and regrettable: most political scientists have perhaps been rebuffed by his shameless display of historical erudition and by the many cryptic transitions of his reasoning. I hope very much that the discussions at this Congress will help to make his work better known. I would strongly urge our Canadian colleagues to organize one or two symposia on the implications of INNIS's work for current theorizing in comparative politics: there is a great need for systematic translation of his core concepts and analyses into the language of contemporary research.

From my particular perspective, Harold INNIS made one decisive contribution: he showed how changes in the technique and in the economy of communication over long distances conditioned the territorial reach and the cultural content of political systems. INNIS's great strength as a scholar lay in his uncommon grasp of concrete details and his extraordinary ability to see connections, parallels, isomorphies. He had started out by studying the standard staples of the Canadian economy, fur, cod, minerals, but had become increasingly impressed by the importance of long-distance transportation and communication in the development of economic empires. He devoted the last years of his life to the study of the great staples required for cultural communication: papyrus, parchment, paper. These are the studies of most direct importance for the comparative theory of political systems. INNIS shows convincingly how the transition from oral to written communication favoured the development of the Hellenistic and the Roman empires and how the transition to paper and printing prepared the ground for the great organizational innovations of the modern age: the network of trading centres and the bureaucratic nation-states. INNIS saw very clearly that the same technological developments underlay the two great changes of the 16th to the 18th centuries: the boundary-transcending force of commercial capitalism and the boundary-accentuating force of vernacular national culture. This was INNIS's greatest achievement: he focussed attention on the technology of communication underlying the economy-culture dialectic.

INNIS paid only passing attention to the politics of the new media of the 20th century: radio, film, television. At this Congress, one of the Commissions under our theme I will focus on the political consequences

of the printed versus the electronic media: the Commission headed by our colleague Alfred GROSSER. But this Commission deals with the media of communication to the masses. INNIS was much more concerned with the consequences for polity-building of changes in the technology of person-to-person communication, whether in armies, territorial bureaucracies or commercial or industrial corporations. If he had lived to analyze in detail the consequences of the electronic revolution he would not only have had to consider the telephone but also the technology of bugging and taping. He would have been fascinated by the politics of Watergate: the disruption of political culture brought about by electronic listening devices, the blurring of the boundaries between private and public, oral and recorded, communication.

INNIS focussed on the over-all functions of technologies of communication for the emergence and decline of systems of long-distance control, whether empires, nation-states or multi-national corporations. By contrast, the economist HIRSCHMAN is less concerned with the origins or the fate of such large-scale systems and more with ways of responding to them: with strategies in coping with decline in performance. In his intriguing Exit, Voice and Loyalty, HIRSCHMAN presents a simple model for the analysis of communications between the recipients and the providers of goods, services, facilities, policies: communications between customers and firms, employees and employers, parents and school authorities, taxpayers and officials, subjects and governors. What makes this essay of such great interest is not the attempt to analyze political processes in economic terms, we have seen a ploethora of such attempts in the recent decade: what makes

it intriguing is the attempt to introduce political concepts into the analysis of economic relations. HIRSCHMAN not only generalizes from the market to the polity: he also studies the possibilities of introducing the mechanisms of political response into the economy. To be more precise he not only analyzes the uses of the typical market response of exit in such eminently political situations as elections of officers, resignations from office and exile to another territory; he also analyzes the uses of the pre-eminently political device of voice, of demonstrations, referenda and elections in relation to producers, employers and providers of services. HIRSCHMAN's is a genuine attempt at bridge-building in the social sciences and it is particularly important at this Congress because his distinctions fit our theme so directly: Voice is the essence of Politics, Exit represents the Economy, and Loyalty can be interpreted to represent a decisive component of Culture.

We had hoped to have HIRSCHMAN take part in this plenary session and to have him expound in further detail the possible applications of his model at different levels and in different sectors of society. Personally I would very much have wanted to have heard him elaborate further on the links between his concept of loyalty and the various components of culture. Unfortunately HIRSCHMAN could not come to our Congress but his work will no doubt be discussed in a number of the Commissions under our theme.

Paradoxically this important essay by an eminent economist raises fundamental questions about the limits of economic reasoning: about the cultural and the political conditions for the emergence and the maintenance of market mechanisms.

From a broader theoretical perspective, HIRSCHMAN's essay is particularly important because it focusses attention on the boundaries for the exertion of market choices and the channeling of voice. What made the HIRSCHMAN volume so important for me in my personal work was that it forced me to think seriously about boundaries. In the analysis of economic transactions boundaries can be dealt with within a strict cost-benefit perspective: tariffs, labour market restrictions, restrictions on the transfer of capital and technology. As soon as you try to tackle the politics of transactions across boundaries you have to develop much more complex models: you have to consider a wider range of motives both for the transcendence of borders and for the protection of the integrity and the distinctiveness of the given territorial system. In the simplifying model I have worked out for differentiations within Europe I distinguish three sets of border transactions: the exit and the entry of goods and services, the exit and the entry of agents of control, the exit and the entry of messages. In the total autarky there is complete isolation from the surrounding world: no import or export, no visas in or out, censorship of all messages crossing the frontiers. In the totally open society the borders would be simply lines on the map: nothing would happen to anything or anyone crossing them. The historically important cases can all be ranged at points between these extremes, but on different dimensions: what we have to study are the strategies for differentiated control and the consequences of such strategies for the configurations of political resources inside each territory.

To develop a general theory of the building, maintenance and differentiation of system boundaries we clearly have to go beyond the strict confines of politics and economics: we have to see what can be learnt from the analyses and the findings of biologists, of linguists, of anthropologists. What is so intriguing about HIRSCHMAN's essay is that it compels you to think through a dazzling variety of conceptual polarities across all levels of living systems: from molecular biology to theories of animal and human communication, from the ecology of the gene pool through the study of human kinship structures to the geopolitics of nation-building, from the ethology of territoriality and boundary maintenance to the economics of long-distance trading.

At all levels of life we can identify structures and processes ensuring some minimal maintenance of established systems: the genetic code in cells, the homeostatic mechanisms and the immune defenses in organisms, the mechanisms for ensuring reproductive isolation in animals, the rites and the languages separating one human population from the other.

In Hirschman's model these would be the loyalty mechanisms: the structures forcing the component parts to stay within the given system.

At all levels of life we can also identify structures and processes ensuring communication among component parts and from one system to another: the RNA molecules in cells, the nervous system in organisms, the signals and the symbols developed in interactions among animals and among humans.

In Hirschman's model these would be voice mechanisms: structures ensuring regular supplies of information from component parts and from outside about conditions affecting the functioning of the system.

At all levels of life, we can finally identify sources of change and breakdown, transformation and transcendence: mutations in the DNA chains,

invasions of viruses into organisms, hybridization of plant and animal populations, shifts in ecology, new opportunities, new resource combinations created through long-distance mobility and interchange.

In the Hirschman model, a crucial mechanism of change is the exit: the transfer of a component part from one system to another, the crossing of an established boundary.

There are well-known hazards in the study of evolutionary parallels or analogies: we know of only too many examples of rash speculations on the basis of flimsy and accidental information. But there are many signs indicating that we are entering a phase of serious and systematic analyses of the implications of our biological heritage for the structuring of human societies and political systems. Personally, I see fascinating possibilities of theory development in the studies by population geneticists and by ethologists of mechanisms and rituals of reproductive isolation and spatial separation: the extraordinary range of devices to protect gene pools against hybridization and the fascinating repertoires of signals and postures designed to demarcate the borders of home ranges for troops of primates. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the development of human languages served parallel purposes of isolation, separation, identity-building: the gift of language was uniquely and universally human, common to the species homo sapiens , but the functions of the particular languages established within particular ecologically delimited populations was to strengthen boundaries, to build up distinctive cultures.

Noam CHOMSKY and his disciples have argued with great force that languages cannot possibly be passed on from generation to generation

through ordinary processes of learning: the acquisition of languages can only be explained through the development of a species-specific capacity to search for and to construct rules of phonetics, syntax and semantics and to make creative use of such rules in the formulation of endless varieties of sentences never directly learned. But children are not given a chance to search for rules in more than one, two or at best three languages during their phase of maximal capacity: the ability to reconstruct languages is universal but this great potential is only realized in quite specific and quite limited contexts, the contexts of the corporate groups surrounding the child, whether family, lineage or local community. And what is even more important is that this process of language acquisition is part and parcel of a general process of growth into the culture of that particular corporate group: it is part of a general process of identity-building, of ego strengthening. This is the human predicament: the language or languages acquired in the early phase of childhood help to build up the ego and tie the ego to the rituals, the customs, the cultural identity of what biologists would call the home range. This predicament sets definite costs both for individual exit and for the extension and merger of home ranges into larger territorial collectivities. There are technologies for overcoming such costs: the invention of writing was a decisive first step, the organization of script religions and systems of education another. But these technologies only weakened some borders and strengthen others: the commitment to shared cultural heritages clashed with the exigencies of economic expansion no less than with the ambitions of the builders of empires and nation-states. There is a culture-polity dialectic

as well as a culture-economy dialectic: in formulating a major theme for this Congress we tried to join up this double dialectic into a triangle of interdependencies.

You will recognize this triangular structure in commission after commission under our theme. You will find sessions focussing on politics and culture from the vantage point of the economic theory of public goods. You will find sessions on the cultural analysis of political action and you will find a broad range of discussions of the politics and the economics of linguistic conflict, of nation-building, of the supranational regional communities. You will also find a number of commissions on particular components in this interplay between culture, economy and politics: sessions on centre-periphery contrasts, sessions on economic class and cultural identity, on the role of the church, the mass media and of the institutions of violence in this triangle of relationships. We chose twelve fields for detailed discussion of this great theme: we could no doubt have defined twelve more. What is important is not the number of fields of application, but the over-all intellectual effort. If political science is to become truly a world-wide discipline it must not flinch from facing the great issues: the proliferation of multi-national economic networks, the stubbornness of local and national cultures. And our discipline must not flinch from constant two-way exchanges with the other sciences of life, man and society. We have our unique responsibility: it is our job to study the development, the structuring, and the performance of systems of government. But we cannot hope to move forward towards higher levels of systematization and understanding without close interaction

with the disciplines which can tell us about the objects of political control and communication: individuals and families, cultural communities, economic organizations and networks. Our discipline has a clearcut and well-established subject, but in studying that subject we must never abandon the search for methods, models, ideas, clues across the entire range of the sciences of life, man, culture and society.

I. P. S. A. | International Political Science Association
A. I. S. P. | Association Internationale de Science Politique

Secretariat général : Rue des Champs Elysées 43 — B - 1050 Bruxelles - Belgique
Tél. : Bruxelles : 48.34.38

IX th World Congress
MONTREAL
19-25 / VIII / 1973

septembre 1973

IX th WORLD CONGRESS - IPSA

IX e CONGRES MONDIAL - AISP

Montréal 20-25/VIII/1973

WORKING PAPERS - RAPPORTS

- Number of Papers/Nombre de rapports : (145.)
- Editing/Tirage : 650 copies
- Pages : 3.281) 2.132.650 pages
- Average/Moyenne : 22,7 pages/rapport.

x x
x

THEME I

I. 1	:10,11,12,13,14.	
I. 2	:10,11,12,13,14.	
I. 3	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16.	
I. 4	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18.	
I. 5	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16.	- NR.
I. 6	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16.	
I. 7	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18.	
I. 8	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22.	- NR.
I. 9	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19.	
I. 10	:10,11,12,13,14,15.	
I. 11	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20.	- NR.
I. 12	:10,11,12,13,14.	

x x
x

THEME II

II. 1	:10,11,12,13,14.	- NR.
II. 2	:10,11,12,13,14.	
II. 3	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17.	- NR.
II. 4	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16.	
II. 5	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19.	- NR1, NR2.
II. 6	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17.	
II. 7	:10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17.	
II. 8	: -	

NR = Not reproduced/Non reproduit

Deadline for Manuscripts	: March 1st, 1973.
Date limite pour les Manuscrits	: 1 er mars 1973.

Papers received / Rapports reçus

1°	March 1st/1er mars	: 12	
2°	April 1st/1er avril	: 45	: 57
3°	May 1st/1er mai	: 22	: 79
4°	June 1st/1er juin	: 28	: 107
5°	July 1st/1er juillet	: 14	: 121
6°	July 20th/20 juillet	: 10	: 131
7°	during the congress	: 14	: 145.

THEME I :

POLITICS BETWEEN ECONOMY AND CULTURE.

LA POLITIQUE ENTRE L'ECONOMIE ET LA CULTURE.

Stein ROKKAN
University of Bergen

I. 1 Economic Models for Political Analysis : Markets, Elections, Public Goods.

Modèles économiques pour analyse politique : marchés, élections, biens publics.

Douglas RAE, Center for Advanced Studies, Stanford, California. U.S.A.

Michael TAYLOR, University of Essex, Colchester. U.K.

I. I-10 Bo BJURULF, University of Lund : A Simulating Analysis of Selected Voting Procedures.

I. I-11 Gordon TULLOCK, Rice University : Corruption in Politics.

I. I-12 Jacques ATTALI, Fondation Nationale des Sciences politiques Paris : Analyse économique du rôle de la propagande dans le système politique.

I. I-13 Hayward R. ALKER Jr., M.I.T. : Are There Voluntaristic Structural Models of Public Goods Generation ?

I. I-14 Norman SCHOFIELD, University of Essex : Dynamical Models of Behaviour.

I. 2 The Cultural Analysis of Political Action : Codes, Meanings, Styles.

L'analyse culturelle de l'action politique : codes, significations, procédés.

Erik ALLARDT, University of Helsinki - Finland

I. 2-10 Erik ALLARDT, University of Helsinki : The Relation of Welfare Values to Culture and Economy.

I. 2-11 Joji WATANUKI, Sophia University - Japan : Change and Persistence in Socio-political Behavior, the Japanese Case.

I. 2-12 S. N. EISENSTADT, Hebrew University of Jerusalem : Cultural Models and Political Systems.

I. 2-13 William M. LAFFERTY, Institute for Social Research, Oslo : Culture and Political Action : The Meaning of Need within the Structure of Evil.

I. 2-14 Daniel H. LEVINE, University of Michigan : The Meaning of Politics to Catholic Elites in Latin America.

I. 3 Models of the Polity : Social, Economic, Cultural.

Modèles de gestion politique : sociaux, économiques, culturels.

Richard ROSE, University of Strathclyde - U.K.

I. 3-10 Ira SHARKANSKY, University of Wisconsin - Madison : Structural Correlates of Least Developed Economies : Parallels in Governmental Forms, Politics and Public Policies among the Least Developed Countries and the Least Developed (U.S.) States.

I. 3-11 Murray EDELMAN, University of Wisconsin : The State as a Provider of Symbolic Outputs.

I. 3-12 Stéphane BERNARD, Université Libre de Bruxelles : Etat - Société globale - Système politique.

I. 3-13 Richard ROSE, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow : Models of Governing.

I. 3-14 R. Joseph MONSEN, University of Washington and Bruce M. RUSSETT, Yale University : "The Political Entrepreneur : the Utility of Small Polyarchies ".

I. 3-15 Ali MAZRUI, Makerere University - Kampala : The Polity as an Extended Family.

I. 3-16 Wolfgang ZAPF, University of Mannheim : The Polity as Monitor of the Quality of Life.

I. 4 Centre vs. Periphery : Economic, Cultural and Ideological Dimensions of Territorial Conflict.

Centre contre périphérie : Dimensions économiques, culturelles et idéologiques de la lutte pour l'espace vital.

John MEISEL, Queen's University, Kingston - Canada.

Derek URWIN, Institute of Sociology, University of Bergen - Norway.

I. 4-10 Simon SCHWARTZMAN, Vargas Foundation - Rio de Janeiro : Economic Impulse and Patrimonial Politics : Brazil.

I. 4-11 Michel BASSAND, Université de Genève : Le séparatisme jurassien.

I. 4-12 Sidney TARROW, Cornell University-Ithaca : Integration at the Periphery : Partisanship and Political Exchange among French and Italian Elites.

I. 4-13 J. M. COUSINS, R. L. DAVIS, M. PADDON, A. WATON, University of Durham : Aspects of Contradiction in Regional Policy : the Case of North East England.

I. 4-14 David R. CAMERON, Richard I. HOFFERBERT, University of Michigan : The Impact of Federalism on Educational Spending : Patterns within and across Nations.

I. 4-15 Charles F. LEVINE, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle : Community Organizations and the Daley Machine; Center-Periphery Politics in Chicago.

I. 4-16 Bruce J. BERMAN, Queen's University-Kingston-Ontario : Clientelism and Neo-colonialism : Center-Periphery Relations and Political Development in African States.

I. 4-17 Peter GOUREVITCH, Harvard University : Reforming the Napoleonie State.

I. 4-18 Frank AAREBROOT, University of Bergen : Regional Differences in Political Mobilization in Norway : Local Infrastructure Development, Political Polarization and Suffrage Extension 1868-1897.

I. 5 Economic Class and Cultural Identity.

Classe économique et identité culturelle.

Mattei DOGAN, C.N.R.S., Paris - France

Charles NIXON, University of California, Los Angeles - U.S.A.

I. 5-10 William M. LAFFERTY, Institute for Social Research - Oslo : The Emergence of Radical Socialism : Structural vs. Cultural Explanations.

I. 5-11 François-Pierre GINGRAS, McMaster University, Hamilton : Coordonnées socio-économiques et identité culturelle : le cas de l'engagement des indépendantistes Québecois.

I. 5-12 Jean-Paul CHARNAY, C.N.R.S. - Paris : Stratification économique et dimensions culturelles dans les pays arabes.

I. 5-13 William SCHNEIDER, Harvard University : Issues, Voting and Cleavages - A Methodology and some Tests.

I. 5-14 Brian H. SMITH and José Luis RODRIGUEZ, Yale University : The Working Class in Chile : The Convergence of Economic Class and Cultural Factors.

I. 5-15 Manindra Kumar MOHAPATRA, Old Dominion University : The Scheduled Caste and the Tribal Political Elites in an Indian State.

I. 5-16 Najdan PASIC, University of Beograd : Interests of Social Classes and National Interests in a Multinational State.

I. 5-NR Miloslav FORMANEK, Institute for Philosophy and Sociology-Praha : The Working Class in Scientific Technological Revolution.

I. 6 The Politics of Linguistic Conflict.

Politique et conflits linguistiques.

Jean LAPONCE, University of British Columbia, Vancouver - Canada.

I. 6-10 William F. MACKEY, Université Laval-Québec : Linguistic Forces and the Feasibility of Language Policies.

I. 6-11 Carl J. FRIEDRICH, Harvard University : Corporate Federalism and Linguistic Politics.

I. 6-12 Kenneth D. McRAE, Carleton University : The Principle of Territoriality and the Principle of Personality in Multilingual States.

I. 6-13 J. A. LAPONCE, University of British Columbia : Relating Linguistic to Political Conflicts : the Problem of Language Shift in Multilingual Societies.

I. 6-14 Ali A. MAZRUI, Makerere University, Kampala : The Political Sociology of Oratory : Power and Persuasion in Black Africa.

I. 6-15 Arendt LIJPHART, University of Leiden : Linguistic Fragmentation and other Dimensions of Cleavage : a Comparison of Belgium, Canada and Switzerland.

I. 6-16 Henry H. KERR, Jr., University of Geneva : Social Cleavages and Partisan Conflict in Switzerland.

I. 7 Religion as a Factor in Identity-Building.

La religion comme facteur de prise de conscience sociale et nationale.

Léo MOULIN, Collège d'Europe, Bruges - Belgique.

I. 7-10 Henry J. PRATT, Wayne State University : Organizational Stress and Adaptation to Changing Political Status : the Case of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A..

I. 7-11 Guy HERMET, Fondation nationale des Sciences politiques - Paris : Le catholicisme en tant que cadre de prise de conscience politique dans les régimes autoritaires contemporains.

I. 7-12 C. LALIVE d'EPINAY, Université de Genève et J. ZYLBERBERG, Université de Concepcion : Les religions au Chili entre l'aliénation et la prise de conscience.

I. 7-13 Illan GREILSAMMER, University of Bar-Ilan : Religion nationalisme, et état dans le judaisme.

I. 7-14 Thomas MADRON, Hart NELSEN and Raytha YOKLEY, Western Kentucky University : Religion as a Determinant of Militancy and Participation among Black Americans.

I. 7-15 Daniel SEILER, Fac. Univ. Notre Dame de la Paix, Namur - Belgique : La crise du clivage Eglise/Etat, le cas wallon - Théorie et confrontation.

I. 7-16 F. COLONNA, Centre de Recherches Anthropologiques, Alger : Résistance culturelle et conquête de la légitimité religieuse dans l'Algérie coloniale.

I. 7-17 Robert CLUTE, University of Georgia : Policy Making in the Episcopal Church.

I. 7-18 Georges GORIELY, Université Libre de Bruxelles : Religion et sentiment national.

I. 8 Economy and Culture in the Politics of Nation-Building.

Economie et culture dans la politique de construction nationale.

Ali MAZRUI, Makerere University, Kampala - Uganda. (currently : Center for Advanced Studies, Stanford-California).

I. 8-10 Donald ROTHCHILD, University of California, Davis : Economic Stratification and Conflict Management in Kenya : a Bargaining Approach.

I. 8-11 James R. SCARRITT, University of Colorado : The Significance of Sequencing and Timing of Cultural, Economic, Stratification, and Political Change in Similar Polities : Anglophone African Party States.

I. 8-12 Obaidul HUQ, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh : The New Ideology : Key to Nation-Building in Bangladesh.

I. 8-13 Yasumasa TANAKA, Gakushuin University, Tokyo : Toward a Multi-Level, Multi-Stage Model of Modernization : a Case Study of Japanese Opinion Leaders on the Present and Future National Goals.

I. 8-14 Selwyn D. RYAN, Trinidad : Politics in an Artificial Society : the Case of Bermuda.

I. 8-15 Preston KING, University of Nairobi : Society, State Formation and Modernization.

I. 8-16 Ali MAZRUI, Makerere University, Kampala : Nation-Building and Race-Building : Israël and Amin's Uganda as Racially Purist States.

I. 8-17 Anton BEBLER, University of Ljubljana : The African Military, Nationalism and Economic Development : the Case of Sierre-Leone 1967-1968.

I. 8-18 Marcos KAPLAN, Foundation Bariloche, Buenos Aires : Scientific-Technical Cooperation and Multinational Public Corporations in Latin America.

I. 8-19 Nelson KASFIR, Dartmouth College, Hanover, U.S.A. : Deparcipation and Political Development in Black African Politics.

I. 8-20 A.G.G. GINGYERA-PINYCWA, Makerere University, Kampala : Political Development and Ideological Void : Uganda under Apolo Milton Obote.

I. 8-21 Ajit Kumar SHARMA, Gauhati University, India : Language Policy and India's National Development. (Dilemna of Nationhood in Post Colonial Conditions)

I. 8-22 Abdul A. SAID and Luiz R. SIMMONS, The American University, Washington, D.C. : Ethnicity and Neo-Ethnicity in Development and Foreign Policy.

I. 8-NR Elena FLOREAL, Institute for Political Sciences and the Study of the National Problem, Bucarest : Fundamentals of the Policy of Economic and Cultural Constructions of the Romanian Nation.

I. 9 The Politics of Regional Integration : Economic Interdependencies and Cultural Entrenchments.

La politique d'intégration régionale : interdépendances économiques et autonomie culturelle.

Dusan SIDJANSKI, Université de Genève, Suisse.

P. PISKOTIN, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, U.S.S.R..

I. 9-10 Henri VALEN, University of Oslo : Norway : "NO" to E.E.C..

I. 9-11 Zbigniew KAMECKI, Central School of Planification and Statistics, Warsaw : Essai d'un bilan général de la coopération économique entre les pays du Conseil d'Assistance économique mutuelle

I. 9-12 A.M. AKIWUMI, Economic Commission for Africa : The Role of the Public Servant in the East African Community.

I. 9-13 Barbara HASKEL, McGill University : Disparities, Strategies and Opportunity Costs.

I. 9-14 Melchiade YADI, Université de Genève : Politiques d'harmonisation industrielle de l'UDEAC et de la CAE.

I. 9-15 Françoise de la SERRE, Fondation nationale des Sciences politiques, Paris : Processus d'élargissement des Communautés européennes et intégration régionale.

I. 9-16 Shlomo ARONSON, Hebrew University, Jerusalem : Relativity of Time in Complex Political Processes : The Example of the European Community.

I. 9-17 Dusan SIDJANSKI et Ural AYBERK, Université de Genève : Bilan des groupes, et du processus de décision dans la Communauté des Six.

I. 9-18 L.P. SINGH, Sir George Williams University : International System and Economic Cooperation in Asia.

I. 9-19 Gerhard MALLY, The Atlantic Council of the U.S. : Regionalism in Western and Eastern Europe.

I. 10 The Political Roles of Violence.

Rôles politiques de la violence.

Sam E. FINER, University of Manchester - U.K.

Martin SELIGER, Hebrew University, Jerusalem - Israël.

I. 10-10 H. L. NIEBURG, State University of New York :
The Transaction Paradigm : a Critique.

I. 10-11 Arnold A. ROGOW, City University of New York :
Some Psychological Aspects of Agression and War.

I. 10-12 Thomas A. RUSCH, California State University :
Comparative Measurement of the Political Costs and Consequences of Political Violence and Non-Violence in Conflict Resolution.

I. 10-13 Deodato RIVERA - FLACSO - Chile :
Toward a Theory of Political Agression.

I. 10-14 Julius GOULD, University of Nottingham :
Social-Control and Violence : the Student Case.

I. 10-15 Sam E. FINER, University of Manchester, and Martin SELIGER, Hebrew University Jerusalem :
Political Roles of Violence.

I. 11- The Political Economy of Mass Communications.

La politique des "Mass media" : facteurs économiques et culturels.

Alfred GROSSER, Institut d'Etudes politiques, Paris - France

Vladimir TOUMANOV, Institute of State and Law, Academy of Sciences, Moscow - U.S.S.R..

I. 11-10 Edward W. CHESTER, University of Texas, Arlington : Political Television and the 1972 U.S. Presidential Election in Historical Perspective.

I. 11-11 Colin SEYMOUR-URE, University of Kent, Canterbury : Mass Media and Party Systems.

I. 11-12 Gabriel THOVERON, Institut de Sociologie de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles : Notes sur les campagnes électorales à la télévision.

I. 11-13 J.G. BLUMLER, University of Leeds : Audience Roles in Political Communications, Some Reflections.

I. 11-14 Neal E. CUTLER, University of Helsinki and Albert S. TEDESCO, University of Pennsylvania : Televised Images of the Political System : a Comparative Message Analysis of Prime-Time Entertainment Programming and Network in the United States.

I. 11-15 Georges H. MOND, Université de Droit, d'Economie et de Sciences Sociales de Paris : La concentration de la presse dans les pays socialistes.

I. 11-16 Alfred GROSSER, Institut d'Etudes politiques, Paris : La politique des "Mass Media" : facteurs économiques et culturels Note d'orientation.

I. 11-17 Harry PROSS, Free University of Berlin : Radio and Television as Political Institutions, the Symbolic Approach.

I. 11-18 Itzhak GALNOR, Hebrew University - Jerusalem The Politics of Public Information

I. 11-19 Roland CAYROL, Fondation nationale des Sciences politiques - Paris : Publicité et politique

I. 11-20 Stig HADENIUS, University of Gothenburg, and Svennik HØYER, University of Oslo, and Lennart WEIBULL, Institute of Political Science, University of Göteborg : Towards a Comparative Perspective on Political Communications.

I. 11-NR Pavel CAMPEANU, Bucarest :
La télévision : conséquences non économiques d'une condition économique.

I. 12- Establishments and Countercultures : the Politics of the Generation Gap.

Sociétés établies et contre-cultures : la politique et le conflit des générations.

Georges LAVAU, Fondation nationale des Sciences politiques - Paris - France.

I. 12-10 Aristide ZOLBERG, University of Chicago : Toward the Origins of Counter-Culture : France and America.

I. 12-11 Annick PERCHERON, CNRS - Paris : Apprentissages culturels et conditions d'émergence de nouvelles valeurs.

I. 12-12 Jeanine MOSSUZ, CNRS - Paris : Radicalisme politique et permissivité sociale, contribution à l'étude d'une contre-culture française.

I. 12-13 Alan MARSH, Survey Unit, Social Science Research Council : Exploration in Unorthodox Political Behaviour - A Scale to Measure " Protest Potential".

I. 12-14 Neal CUTLER, University of Helsinki and University of Southern California : On the Road from Cohort Analysis to Political Demography : Generational Elements of National Security Policy Thinking in Finland.

THEME II :

KEY ISSUES IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT AND PEACE RESEARCH.

QUESTIONS ESSENTIELLES DANS LES CONFLITS INTERNATIONAUX ET LA RECHERCHE SUR LA PAIX.

Karl W. DEUTSCH
Harvard University

II. 1 Conflicts between Social Systems : how Fundamental and how Manageable ?

Conflits entre systèmes sociaux : dans quelle mesure sont-ils fondamentaux, dans quelle mesure peut-on les maîtriser ?

Roy MACRIDIS, Brandeis University - U. S. A.

Stanislaw EHRLICH, University of Warsaw - Poland.

II. 1-10 A. B. MROZEK, University of Warsaw : US-China Relations. Factors of Conflict and Reconciliation 1949-1972.

II. 1-11 K. J. HOLSTI, University of British Columbia : The Maldeveloped and Underdeveloped States : Potential for Conflict in the Declining Western Emperium.

II. 1-12 James R. KURT, Harvard University : Economic Systems, Hegemonial Policies and International Conflicts.

II. 1-13 Kjell GOLDMANN, Swedish Institute of International Affairs : The Road to Peaceful Coexistence : Notes on the Analysis of European Tension 1946-1970.

II. 1-14 Kenneth THOMPSON, The Rockefeller Foundation : The Prospects and Limitations of Conflict Adjustement among Collectivities.

II. 1-NR Walter ROMAN, Université de Bucarest : La révolution scientifique-technique, arène importante de la compétition historique entre le socialisme et le capitalisme.

II. 2 Imperialism and International Inequality : Concepts and Data·

Impérialisme et inégalité internationale : concepts et données.

Helio JAGUARIBE, Inst. Univ. de Pesquisas, Rio de Janeiro - Brazil.

Samuel ZIVS, Institute of State and Law, Academy of Sciences Moscow - U.S.S.R.

II. 2-10 S. N. EISENSTADT, Hebrew University of Jerusalem : Some Preliminary Observations on the Pattern of Transformation of Traditional and Modern International and Imperial Systems.

II. 2-11 Henry BARBERA, City University of New York : World War and World Development Continuity and Change in the Stratification of Nations. Rich and Poors from 1913 through 1952.

II. 2-12 Jorge d'OLIVEIRA e SOUSA, Université Catholique de Louvain et PRIO : L'impérialisme intra-étatique : aspects théoriques et empiriques . Le cas du Bengladesh.

II. 2-13 Veniamin TCHIRKINE, Institute of State and Law, Academy of Sciences, Moscow : The Downfall of the Colonial System of Imperialism and the Liquidation of International Inequality.

II. 2-14 Michael H. GLANTZ, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa : The Nixon Doctrine Sub-Saharan Africa : A Negative Functional Sphere of Influence.

II. 3 Social Change and the Interplay of Internal and International Political Conflicts.

Changements sociaux et interactions entre conflits politiques internes et internationaux.

Ted Robert GURR, Northwestern University, Evanston - U.S.A.

II. 3-10 Walter C. SODERLUNG, University of Windsor : "Intervention : the Challenge and the Response".

II. 3-11 Ted Robert GURR, Northwestern University, Evanston : Social Change and the Interplay of Internal and International Political Conflicts.

II. 3-12 George MODELSKI, University of Washington : Conflict Stability and Intergovernmental Elite Networks : a Study of World Order in 1965.

II. 3-13 Michael STOHL, Purdue University, Lafayette : Linkages between War and Domestic Violence : a Quasi-Experimental Analysis.

II. 3-14 Jonathan WILKENFELD, University of Maryland : Domestic Conflict in the Middle East : an Analysis of International Inputs.

II. 3-15 Astri SUHRKE, American University - Washington : Irredentism Contained : the Hai-Muslim Case.

II. 3-16 N.M. SHAMUYARIRA, University of Dar-Es-Salam : Inter-Penetration of the Southern African State System.

II. 3-17 Jean-Pierre DERRIENNIC, Fondation nationale de Sciences politiques - Paris : Idéologies stratégiques et conflits transnationaux.

II. 3-NR Stanislav KUCERA, Charles University, Prague : Somme Comments upon the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Revolution.

II. 4 Decisions of International War and Peace : The Role of Domestic Interests and National Decision Systems.

Décisions en matières de guerre internationale et de paix : le rôle des groupes d'intérêts et des systèmes nationaux de décision.

K. J. HOLSTI, University of British Columbia - Canada.

Dieter SENGHAAS, Hessian Foundation for Peace Research, Frankfurt - F. R. Germany.

II. 4-10 K. P. MISRA, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi : Intrastate Imperialism as a Factor in Conflicts within and between States.

II. 4-11 Michael BRECHER, McGill University and Hebrew University of Jerusalem : Environmental Inputs and Decisions for War and Peace, the Israeli Experience.

II. 4-12 James N. ROSENAU, Georges H. RAMSEY, Jr., Ohio State University : External vs. Internal Sources of Foreign Policy Behaviour : Testing the Stability of an Intriguing Set of Findings.

II. 4-13 J. D. B. MILLER, Australian National University : Domestic Politics and Alliance Requirements : the Australian Commitment to the Vietnam War.

II. 4-14 K. J. HOLSTI, University of British Columbia : Introductory Remarks.

II. 4-15 Chihiro HOSOYA, Hitotsubashi University : National Decision Systems for War and Peace : the Japanese Experience.

II. 4-16 Dieter SENGHAAS, Hessian Foundation for Peace Research - Frankfurt : The Impact of Domestic Interests and National Decisions Systems in the post - 1945 Arms Race : some Reflections on Armament Dynamics.

II. 5 Pathways to Peace : National Sovereignty of Supra-National Integration ?

Chemins de la paix : Souveraineté nationale ou intégration supra-nationale ?

Ghita ICNESCU, University of Manchester - U.K.

II. 5-10 Max BELOFF, All Souls College, Oxford : The Political Crisis of the European Nation-States.

II. 5-11 Donald J. PUCHALA, Columbia University : Internal Order and Peace : an Integrated Europe in World Affairs.

II. 5-12 Léon DION, Université Laval, Québec : Anti-politique et marginaux.

II. 5-13 David COOMBES, Loughborough University : Concertation at National and Community Level.

II. 5-14 Herbert J. SPIRO, Department of State, U.S.A. : Interdependence : a Third Option between National Sovereignty and Supra-National Integration.

II. 5-15 Ghita IONESCU, University of Manchester : The two Levels of Governability of Industrial Societies.

II. 5-16 Geoffrey GOODWIN, London School of Economics : The Erosion of External Sovereignty ?

II. 5-17 David E. APTER, Yale University : The Premise of Parliamentary Planning.

II. 5-18 Dennis KAVANAGH, University of Manchester : Beyond Autonomy ? The Politics of Corporations.

II. 5-19 Henri ETIENNE, Commission Economique Européenne : L'Emergence d'une souveraineté européenne.

II. 5-NR1 Karel POMAIZL, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Prague : Pathways to peace : National Sovereignty or Supranational Integration

II. 5-NR2 Ion CETERCHI, Academie des Sciences, Bucarest : La souveraineté et la coopération des Etats

II. 6 Arms Control and Disarmament : Problems and Prospects.

Contrôle des armements et désarmement : problèmes et perspectives.

Karl KAISER, University of Saarlandes, F.R. Germany.

A. BOGDANOV, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

II. 6-10 Frank BARNABY, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) : Disarmament in the Field of B and C Weapons.

II. 6-11 Longin PASTUSIAK, Polish Institute of International Affairs Warsaw : East-West Relations and Arms Control : Achievements and Prospects.

II. 6-12 Ulrich ALBRECHT, Free University Berlin : Arms Trade and Arms Control.

II. 6-13 Charles ZORGBIBE, Universités de Paris-Nord et de la Sarre : La conférence sur la sécurité et la coopération en Europe et le contrôle des armements.

II. 6-14 Ljubivoje ACIMOVIC, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Beograd : Disarmament in Europe.

II. 6-15 Alain JOXE, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes Sorbonne : Maîtrise des armements dans les pays sous-développés.

II. 6-16 A.N. KALIADIN, U.R.S.S. Academy of Sciences : Achievements and Prospects of Arms Limitation.

II. 6-17 Milton LEITENBERG, The Swedish Institute of International Affairs : Salt as a Means of Arms Control : A Critical Analysis of the Salt Talks.

II. 7- The Relevance of International Law.

L'Impact du droit international.

Marcel MERLE, Université de Paris I - France

II. 7-10 Hans von MANGOLDT, Max-Planck Institute, Heidelberg : The Development of International Arbritation.

II. 7-11 Bhek PATI SINHA, Indiana State University, Terre Haute : The International Court of Justice and the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes.

II. 7-12 Daneil FREI, University of Zurich : The Regulation of Warfare - A Paradigm for the Legal Approach to the Control of International Conflict.

II. 7-13 Max SØRENSEN, University of Aarhus : The Contribution of the European Convention on Human Rights to the Settlement of International Conflicts.

II. 7-14 Christian TOMUSCHAT, University of Bonn : La Contribution de la Cour de justice des Communautés européennes au règlement des conflits entre états membres.

II. 7-15 Philippe MANIN, Universités de Paris I et de Paris-Sud : La prise en considération des procédures et des arguments juridiques dans le règlement des conflits internationaux par l'O. N. U..

II. 7-16 Marcel MERLE, Université de Paris I : L'impact du droit international. Rapport introductif.

II. 7-17 Wojcieck MORAWIECKI, Central School of Planning and Statistics, Warsaw : Extra-Judicial Control of the Conduct of States by International Organizations.

II. 8 Peace Education and Global Social Change.

L'enseignement de la paix et l'évolution sociale globale.

Saul H. MENDLOVITZ, Institute for World Order, New York.